

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes a new Fig. 14 to illustrate another form of the sleeve as set forth in paragraph 46 of the original specification.

Remarks

I would like to thank Examiner Holzen for the telephone interview held on January 5, 2004 regarding the above-identified patent application.

Confirmation of Election

The Applicant's previous election of Invention I for prosecution in this patent application is hereby confirmed. The Applicant does not contest the restriction as to Invention II and claims 31-33 drawn thereto have been canceled without prejudice to the Applicant's rights to proceed by way of a divisional patent application as to claims 31-33. The Applicant traverses the restriction requirement as to Invention III for the reasons noted below with respect to claims 34-38. The restriction requirement as to Invention IV is now moot in view of the amendments to claim 39 as discussed below.

The Amendments to the Specification and Drawings

The specification and drawings have been amended to refer to and illustrate, respectively, a new Fig. 14 showing a different form of the sleeve 42, namely a ring shaped sleeve 42'. As this subject matter was set forth in paragraph 46 of the original specification, such amendments to the specification and drawings are proper and do not involve the addition of new matter.

Amended Claims 1 and 39

Amended claim 1 was specifically discussed with Examiner Holzen during the interview. Examiner Holzen indicated that

amended claim 1 appeared to be allowable. The Examiner agreed that no references of record teach the type of relative sliding motion now set forth as occurring between the riser lines and the riser line gathering device to permit controlled wing collapse and inflation.

Method claim 39 has been amended similarly to apparatus claim 1 such that both are directed to the elected invention. The Examiner also agreed that amended claim 39 was allowable for the same reasons pertaining to claim 1 and that the restriction requirement as to claim 39 would be withdrawn.

Accordingly, claims 1, 2 and 39 are allowable.

Amended Claim 28

Amended claim 28 was also specifically discussed with Examiner Holzen during the interview. As pointed out to the Examiner, parachute 22 is tethered to the top of the mast by at least one flexible tether (56 or 44 or both) in a manner such that the "parachute when fully inflated during flight has a leading edge thereof spaced behind the top end of the mast." Steve's Paramast directly attached the parachute to the top ends of the masts and thus lacked both the claimed flexible tether as well as the rearward spacing of the leading edge of the parachute behind the top end of the mast during flight. No other prior art reference was in any way similar to the subject matter set forth in claim 28.

Examiner Holzen indicated that amended claim 28 defined around Steve's Paramast and appeared to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 28 and 29 are allowable.

Amended Claim 30

Amended claim 30 was also specifically discussed with Examiner Holzen during the interview. However, claim 30 has

been further amended herein to refer only to the flight position of the parachute and to delete the specific reference to the lockout position. The wing elevating cord helps get the parachute into its flight position regardless of the previous non-flight position of the parachute. Thus, claim 30 as amended herein recites that the wing elevating cord pulls:

"upwardly on the parachute adjacent a leading edge of the parachute to aid the parachute in transitioning from a generally-vertical-non-horizontal, partially inflated or uninflated, lockout non-flight position to a generally horizontal, more inflated, flight position."

Examiner Holzen agreed that none of the prior art showed or suggested the type of wing elevating cord being set forth in amended claim 30. Amended claim 30 as presented herein is allowable.

New Claims 40-42

The term "sleeve" as used in allowed claims 3-27 and in the above-identified application was intended to have a broad and expansive meaning to cover any device capable of gathering in and releasing riser lines, including a tubular sleeve, or a ring shaped sleeve, or other types of "sleeves". In allowing claims 3-27, Examiner Holzen noted that U.S. Patent 4,863,119 to Chase did not disclose a sleeve element. However, Chase's reefing device 10 can be considered a sleeve within the broad meaning for that term as used herein, but it is not a sleeve of the type set forth in claims 3-27. For example, the reefing device 10 in Chase only moves downwardly on the riser lines as the parachute opens to retard the rate at which the parachute opens. In addition, Chase only discloses a parachute and not the claimed ultralight aircraft.

New claims 40-42 have been added to clarify that the term sleeve is not intended to be limiting and that different types of members are sleeves, e.g. tubes, rings, etc., within the meaning of that term. The presence of new claims 40-42 and the doctrine of claim differentiation requires that the word sleeve in claims 3-27 be given a broad interpretation. In addition, this also corrects any possible misinterpretation of the Examiner's remarks regarding Chase, i.e. the distinction between Chase and the invention is not the absence of a sleeve but of the type of sleeve set forth in the claims in combination with the other limitations set forth in the claims.

Examiner Holzen agreed at the interview that such clarification of the record was proper and appropriate and that claims 3-27 along with new dependent claims 40-42 would be allowable.

Original Claims 34-38

The Examiner's restriction requirement as to Invention III, namely claims 34-38, is respectfully traversed.

Claims 34-38 relate to maintaining tension in the riser lines (claim 34) by passing the riser lines through a suspension point and using the weight of the hanging parachute to create the tension (claim 35). The claims also call for elevating the suspension point (claim 35) and lowering the suspension point (claim 37). This is, of course, what is accomplished using the vertically movable sleeves already set forth in many of the claims drawn to the elected invention.


Thus, the Examiner has already conducted a search sufficient to permit examination of claims 34-38. It is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement as

to claims 34-38 be withdrawn and that such claims be examined and allowed.

Summary

For all the reasons noted above, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Such allowance and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



January 10, 2005

James W. Miller
Registration No. 27,661
Suite 1005
Foshay Tower
821 Marquette Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone (612) 338-5915